COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND ENERGY

	_)	
TOWN OF FRAMINGHAM REQUEST FOR)	
DETERMINATION OF RATES APPLICABLE TO)	D.T.E. 02-46
TRANSPORTATION AND TREATMENT OF SEWAGE)	
PURSUANT TO INTERMUNICIPAL AGREEMENT)	
	_)	

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF STEPHEN H. GERIBO, P.E.
ON BEHALF OF THE TOWN OF FRAMINGHAM

1

- 1 Q: Please state your name for the record.
- 2 A: Stephen H. Geribo.
- 3 Q: On whose behalf are you offering rebuttal testimony?
- 4 A: On behalf of the Town of Framingham.
- 5 Q: Are you being paid for offering rebuttal testimony on
- 6 behalf of Framingham?
- 7 A: Yes, my company is being paid for the work it is doing on
- 8 behalf of Framingham in this and other matters.
- 9 Q: Have you reviewed the direct testimony of John T. Hannigan
- 10 and Steve Sylven, submitted on behalf of the Town of Ashland?
- 11 A: Yes.
- 12 Q: With respect to Mr. Sylven's testimony at pp. 21-22, and
- 13 Mr. Hannigan's testimony at pp. 6-7, do you agree with the
- 14 testimony of these gentlemen pertaining to the maximum rates of
- 15 discharge permitted under the IMA between Framingham and
- 16 Ashland?
- 17 A: Yes. I note, however, that flow records recently produced
- 18 by Ashland to Framingham demonstrate that Ashland's discharges
- 19 to Framingham's sewer system, on occasion, exceeded the
- 20 permitted discharge rates. We are now conducting a analysis of
- 21 this flow data to determine the frequency with which Ashland
- 22 exceeded the maximum rates of discharge.

- 1 Q: Can you describe one example of an occasion on which
- 2 Ashland's flow indicates that it exceeded the maximum rates of
- 3 discharge?
- 4 A: Yes. Attached as proposed Exhibit FR-19 is a copy of a
- 5 document recently produced by Ashland, which reflects flow
- 6 through the Chestnut Street pumping station during the week of
- 7 December 16, 1996. Per the IMA, Ashland "shall be limited and
- 8 restricted to a maximum rate of discharge of 2.0 million gallons
- 9 per day (or 1400 gallons per minute) of Ashland sewerage with
- 10 the exception that momentary discharge rates not exceeding 2.5
- 11 million gallons per day (or 1750 gallons per minute) for periods
- 12 not in excess of five minutes are permissible". As reflected on
- 13 the attached chart, Ashland's flow during the week of December
- 14 16, 1996 routinely exceeded the 2.0 MGD limit, and even exceeded
- 15 the maximum permissible discharge rate of 2.5 MGD on several
- 16 occasions.
- 17 Q: Did Ashland provide Framingham with a complete set of pump
- 18 station flow records for both the Chestnut Street and Brackett
- 19 Street pumping stations?
- 20 A: No. Ashland produced circular strip charts, similar to
- 21 proposed Exhibit FR-19, for the Chestnut Street pumping station
- 22 for scattered dates in 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, 2001, 2002 and
- 23 2003. Ashland produced pump run meter data for both pumping
- 24 stations for each year in the 1997-2002 time frame, but some of

- 1 the months have incomplete data. We are in the process of
- 2 obtaining detailed flow data from the MWRA in order to ascertain
- 3 the frequency and extent of Ashland's violations of the maximum
- 4 discharge rates for each day during the relevant time period.
- 5 If Ashland had installed functioning Parshall Flume devices at
- 6 the two connection points, as they were required to do under the
- 7 IMA, we already would have this data.
- 8 Q: Does the fact that Ashland violated the discharge rates
- 9 permitted under the IMA impact in any way your opinion as to the
- 10 appropriate formula for calculating Ashland's proper share of
- 11 Framingham's O&M expenses?
- 12 A: This information provides further support for my opinion
- 13 that Ashland's payments for use of Framingham's system should be
- 14 based on the actual Ashland flows into the system, because
- 15 Framingham's costs are directly related to the actual (rather
- 16 than the projected or permissible) amount of these flows. Under
- 17 Ashland's proposed formula, Ashland would not have to pay
- 18 increased amounts to Framingham for O&M even if its actual flows
- 19 increased beyond current levels.
- 20 Q: Directing your attention to Mr. Sylven's testimony at p. 27
- 21 and Mr. Hannigan's testimony at pp. 11-12, do you agree with
- 22 these gentlemens' statements as to the appropriateness of the
- 23 formula proposed by Ashland?

- 1 A: No. Mr. Sylven and Mr. Hannigan state that Framingham and
- 2 Ashland agreed to Ashland's usage of Framingham's sewer system
- 3 "on a blanket basis." I do not agree with this characterization
- 4 of the IMA, which provides that Ashland should pay Framingham a
- 5 "proportionate share of the cost of maintaining said system." I
- 6 also do not agree that the formula described in my direct
- 7 testimony would result in Ashland being charged like any other
- 8 Framingham customer. It is my opinion that Ashland, like any
- 9 other user of the system, should pay a proportionate share of
- 10 the cost of operating the entire system, not just that portion
- 11 of the system Ashland utilizes. It also is my opinion, however,
- 12 that Framingham should assess Ashland on a percentage flow
- 13 basis, i.e., a determination of what percentage of Framingham's
- 14 total flow represents flows received from Ashland, rather than
- 15 on a "per-gallon" flow basis. If Framingham were to apply the
- 16 same tiered per-gallon rate structure to Ashland that it applies
- 17 to those users who reside in Framingham (i.e. treat Ashland like
- 18 all other Framingham sewer customers), Ashland's bill would be
- 19 far in excess of the amounts Framingham is now proposing that
- 20 Ashland should pay.
- 21 Q: Do you agree with Mr. Sylven's testimony at p. 29, and Mr.
- 22 Hannigan's testimony at p. 13, regarding the full flow capacity
- of the Farm Pond Interceptor and the Beaver Dam Interceptor?

- 1 A: I have not calculated the full flow capacity of either
- 2 pipe, and the numbers provided by Mr. Sylven and Mr. Hannigan of
- 3 15.0 MGD and 2.0 MGD do not appear in SEA's Report. I have
- 4 estimated the full flow capacities of these pipes as 10.0 MGD
- 5 and 2.0 MGD.
- 6 Q: Does this conclude your rebuttal testimony?
- 7 A: Yes.

8

9

10